

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 21 and 29 through 33 are pending, with Claim 29 being independent. Claims 4 through 8, 10 through 20, and 23 through 28 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 21 has been amended. Claims 29 through 33 have been added.

Claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 5,913,081 (Okano, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,060,074 (Kinugasa, et al.). Claim 10 was rejected under Okano, et al. and Kinugasa, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,238 (Karasawa, et al.). Claims 12 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Okano, et al. in view of Karasawa, et al. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 recites, inter alia, that a full-open aperture diameter of the diaphragm at a telephoto end during an operation of the image shake correcting function is smaller than a full-open aperture diameter of the diaphragm at a wide-angle end during an operation of the image shake correcting function.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Okano, et al. nor Karasawa, et al., even in combination, assuming, arguendo, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claim 21. The Official Action acknowledges that Okano, et al. is deficient, and therefore relies upon Karasawa, et al.'s Fig. 2., which the Official Action asserts shows varying full-open aperture. This assertion is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that Karasawa, et al. shows, e.g., that:

... F number of the zoom lens changes. Since the F number  
can be obtained by dividing "focal length" by "effective

aperture”, the F number changes even if the mechanical aperture is not changed.

(e.g., col. 8, lines 6-10 (emphasis added)). Given the difference between “F number” and the claimed aperture, Applicants respectfully submit that Karasawa, et al. provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claim 21.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Daniel S. Glueck  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DSG/cmg

DC\_MAIN 231929v1